

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2010/11/17 : CIA-RDP87T00623R000200070022-5

REL Rel
DP —
RJM —
AP ap
BC for
FH —
GMC —
File: 1.2.2.1
Destroy: —

Return to: —

Remarks: Al - what kind of
did Se com receive? Also,
12/15 in [] fighting the
classification of the new
res?

STAT

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2010/11/17 : CIA-RDP87T00623R000200070022-5

① These minutes were presented to me on the day of the last meeting (22 NOV) because Maria wanted to pass them out. In fact, after quickly reviewing them, I reworked them on the TSD machine.

I saw the nuclear sentence about [redacted] but because it was not incorrect (only obscure), I let it go.

TRANSLATION:

Because neither [redacted] nor [redacted] could address the seminar, they ~~so~~ "requested" me to present the message to the group. (Incidentally the following sentence

is somewhat of an orphan.
as you will see when you
look for the antecedent
of "this submission")

② Maria didn't bring
up the classification issue
other than saying that
the original drafting group
of which he was a member,
had been told that
the two parts could be
less than SECRET. Earlier,
[redacted] had stated
concern about more than
Confidential on the handbook.
I said that Walt Elders
was the man, and that
the Subcommittee should
formally request a waiver
if that would help in the
industrial security area.

STAT

STAT

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
SECURITY COMMITTEE
COMPUTER SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

5 Nov. 1983
DCISEC-CSS-M158

STAT 1. The One Hundred and Fifty-Eighth meeting of the Computer Security Subcommittee was held on 18 October 1983 at [redacted] McLean, VA., and was attended by the following persons:

STAT [redacted] Chairman
STAT [redacted] Executive Secretary
STAT [redacted] CIA
[redacted] CIA
[redacted] NSA
Mr. Ralph Neeper, Army
Mr. Carl Martz, Navy
Ms. Sue Berg, Navy
Mr. Robert Graytock, Dept. of Justice
Mr. Gene Epperly, OSD
STAT [redacted] SECOM Staff
STAT [redacted], SECOM staff
STAT [redacted] CIA (observer)

STAT 2. [redacted] provided a summary of the SECOM Seminar held in [redacted] Va during the week of 10 October 1983.

STAT Considerable time was spent discussing computer security, with the discussions primarily focused on the activities initiated by Dr. [redacted] under her contract.

The safeguards for critical systems effort was also a topic of discussion at the seminar. The point of this activity is to engineer and apply, to "critical systems", a set of fixes. Each Intelligence Community agency was requested to nominate a set of its critical systems. A determination will be made as to whether any of the systems have deficiencies and, if so, what the retrofit costs will be. The list of "critical systems" is presently before the Deputy DCI, Mr. McMahon.

STAT The SECOM received a briefing, as requested by [redacted] on required computer security R&D. This submission was intended to reflect R&D which is desired, but currently unfunded. [redacted] noted that the DoD planning and budgeting for computer security, via the Consolidated Computer Security Program (CCSP), had been very thorough. Since the R&D submission to the SECOM was intended to reflect desired but unfunded programs, the submission was not extensive. It was later noted that there is no intelligence analysis activity funded as a community activity. This will be presented to Dr. Davis as a proposed fy 85 item. \$350k will be added to the R&D program to support the production of threat data.

Also discussed were the individual subcommittee budgets, the point

being made to the SECOM that these funds represented critical seed money which is used to initiate programs which might otherwise never see the light of day. It was noted during the discussions that several programs which have benefitted from such seed money have subsequently been picked up, supported, and augmented by the sponsoring Department or Agency (e.g., the IR review program being run by the Navy member).

STAT

3. As a result of the above discussions, [] reviewed the currently proposed DoD R&D program. Enclosure 1 shows those R&D programs (CCSP + individual Agencies) already funded. She pointed out that no money was being requested for these programs, but that support for them was needed during the budget cycle. Enclosure 2 shows those programs which are currently unfunded, and thus could be supported with funds. She also pointed out that DoD had proposed \$9.4M over guidance, which is being strongly supported by the SECDEF.

4. The Navy member reported on the IR review project, indicating that the \$70K of Navy fy 83 funds that were being sought were lost. He is currently requesting \$40K of fy 84 funds from both the Navy and the SECOM. He reported that he was also offered support and funding from the NSA COMSEC organization.

STAT

STAT

5. [] of the SECOM staff, distributed a new proposal for the rewrite of DCID 1/16. The paper represents the policy section, and will ultimately be accompanied by a regulation. [] pointed out that the new document is not organized along the "modes of operation" of the current DCID. Rather, it is structured such that decisions are made based upon where a system falls along each of the three axes of user clearance range, data classification range, and need-to-know range. Since this document had not been previously seen by the Subcommittee, there was little discussion of the contents. The membership was asked to have reviewed it and have comments prepared by the next meeting. [] also claimed that, by direction, all DCID's will be classified SECRET, which is contrary to the Subcommittee's previous guidance.

STAT

STAT

STAT

6. [] announced his retirement from government service; he will be replaced on the Subcommittee by []

STAT

STAT

7. The next meeting was set for 0930 on November 22 at []

STAT

[]
Executive Secretary

5 October 1983

REPORT ON COMPUTER SECURITY RESOURCES

1. Reference SECOM-D-168, Subject FY 85 Computer Security Program, dated 8 August 1983.

2. Responses to the Reference were sorted according to the six general areas identified by the Chairman, (SECOM-D-161, dated 1 August 1983). A summary of the major funded efforts is contained in Enclosure 1. The submissions fall into two categories: by DoD Components (Army, Navy, Air Force, DIA, NSA) and by the other Intelligence Agencies (CIA, State, FBI, DOE).

3. It should be noted that almost all of the DoD Components' submissions are part of the Consolidated Computer Security Program (CCSP). At present the CCSP is funded at the FYDP level for FY1985. An overguidance of \$9.4M has been requested and is being favorably considered by the Secretary of Defense. This increase will support almost all of the "unfunded" tasks identified by the DoD Components. Enclosure 2 identifies the remaining tasks for which additional funds could be sought and the rationale for this recommendation.

4. The unfunded submissions from the other Intelligence Agencies were examined in light of the CCSP. Those tasks for which additional funds could be sought and the rationale for this recommendation are contained in Enclosure 2, also.

5. While the Reference did not limit the resources requirements to R&D tasks, there were no additional funds requested specifically for O&M or Procurements. There is consensus that more resources, both qualified people and dollars, are required to adequately administer the computer security programs of the member agencies.

2 Encls: a/s

ENCLOSURE 1

SUMMARY OF FUNDED COMPUTER SECURITY TASKS

The totals for six subject areas are listed as an example of the magnitude and apportionment of the budget. Individual project descriptions are available if you are interested.

	<u>FY83</u>	<u>FY84</u>	<u>FY85</u>	<u>FY 86-89</u>
STAT 1. POLICY AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT				*
2. THREAT INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS				*
3. SYSTEM CONTROL R&D				*
4. DATA AND MEDIA CON- TROL R&D				*
5. VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGIES				*
6. TRAINING AND PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT				*

*Budget for these years not known.

Page Denied

Next 6 Page(s) In Document Denied